

## SEVERAL DIFFERENT ORIGINS OF THE *U/A* VOWEL-FINAL IMPERATIVE OF SIMPLE VERBS IN THE *E/H/Ē/I* CONJUGATION IN MODERN ARMENIAN DIALECTS

SARGIS AVETYAN \* 

*Yerevan State University*

An attempt is made to show that the *u/a* vowel-final imperative forms of simple verbs in the *h/h ī/i/* (derived from Classical Armenian *h/e/* and *h/i/*) conjugation in modern Armenian dialects have several origins. Specifically, a synchronic and diachronic analysis of the relevant evidence from modern Armenian dialects has allowed us to identify three main lines of development that have led to the appearance of the forms in question: 1) in some dialects (e.g., in the dialects of Agulis, Karčewan, and Kak'avaberd) the form has resulted from the regular sound change of *kuu /ea/* to *u/a/*; 2) in several subdialects within the dialect of Ararat, analogical influence from three high-frequency transitive verbs, namely, *uulq/ asēl/* “to say”, 2 sg. impv. *uulq' asa'* “say!”, *uðlq/ acēl/* (originally meaning “to bring, to adduce!”, later “to fill”), 2 sg. impv. *uðlq' aca/* (originally meaning “bring!, adduce!”, later “fill!”), *uñlq/ anēl/* “to do”, 2 sg. impv. *uñlq' ara/* “do!”, is quite likely to have been responsible for the appearance of the form in question, with the verb *uulq/ asēl/* “to say” having played a pivotal role in this process; 3) in still other dialects (e.g., the dialects of Bayazet and Diadin, and the subdialect of Alaškert), a sound change from *h/ē/* to *u/a/* appears to have occurred in the enclitic 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb *kuu/ em/*, likely due to an articulatory weakening in muscular tension. Later, the vowel *u/a/* was analogically extended from the 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb to the 3 sg. optative of verbs in the *h/e/* conjugation, and from there to the 2 sg. imperative.

**Key words:** the *u/a* vowel-final imperative form, modern Armenian dialects, analogical influence, high-frequency transitive verbs, a sound change from *h/ē/* to *u/a/*, an articulatory weakening, the 2 sg. imperative

In the current paper, Armenian lexical forms are presented in both Armenian characters and transliterated according to the Hübschmann-Meillet-Benveniste system, as outlined in **R. Godel's** *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*, Wiesbaden, 1975, pp. XI, 4.

\* **Sargis Avetyan** – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at YSU Chair of History of the Armenian Language and General Linguistics

**Սարգիս Ավետյան** – բանասիրական գիտությունների թեկնածու, ԵՊՀ հայոց լեզվի պատմության և ընդհանուր լեզվաբանության ամբիոնի դոցենտ

**Саргис Аветян** – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры истории армянского языка и общего языкоznания ЕГУ

Էլ. փոստ՝ [sargisavetyan@ysu.am](mailto:sargisavetyan@ysu.am) <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9474-7129>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Ստացվել է՝ 14.01.2025

Գրախսուվել է՝ 03.03.2025

Հաստատվել է՝ 07.03.2025

© The Author(s) 2025

## Introduction

As is known, in Classical Armenian, the imperative mood and the present indicative (which later developed into the subjunctive or, in Abeļyan's terminology, the optative<sup>2</sup>) were formed independently of one another, with the imperative built on the aorist stem. Moreover, the 2 sg. imperative exhibited formal diversity and sometimes had doublets, especially in the medio-passive inflection type<sup>3</sup>. However, in the further history of the Armenian language, the 2 sg. imperative showed a general tendency toward uniformity. In this respect, the strong analogical interaction between the imperative forms of simple verbs in the *t* /e/ and *h* /i/ conjugations is particularly remarkable. On the other hand, the 2 sg. imperative and the 3 sg. subjunctive/optative (which goes back to the Classical Armenian 3 sg. present indicative) fell together with each other formally due to certain phonetic and analogical changes that occurred by the Middle Armenian period<sup>4</sup>.

Above all, it should be noted that the 2 sg. active imperative of simple verbs of the *t* /e/ conjugation—which originally represented the accented aorist stem without the final *g/c'* in Classical Armenian (cf. *uhpktu*/sirem/ “to love”, aor. stem *uhpktug-* /sireac<sup>-</sup>/, 2 sg. Impv. *uhpktw'*/sirea'/ < *uhpktw'g* /sireac<sup>'</sup>/ “love!”)—in Middle Armenian underwent the phonetic change of *tuw* /ea/ to *t* /ē/, the latter changing further to *h* /i/ in a number of dialects. On the other hand, the final *p/r* in the ending *-hp/-ir* of the 2 sg. medio-passive imperative has been lost, either due to phonetic change or analogy, and this has frequently occurred in the same dialectal areas. Therefore, it is often difficult to say unequivocally in such cases whether the ending *-h/-i* of the 2 sg. imperative has arisen from the phonetic change *tuw* /ea/ > *t* /ē/ > *h* /i/ or has resulted from the loss of the final *p/r* in the original ending *-hp/-ir*, especially in view of the fact that simple verbs of the

<sup>2</sup> In Armenian grammatical tradition, grammarians following M. Abeghyan's approach apply the term “optative” to the mood forms in New Armenian, including modern Armenian dialects, which trace back to the present indicative forms in Classical Armenian. However, these forms are not optative in the strict sense; they would be better termed “subjunctive-optative” or simply “subjunctive” based on their grammatical functions in New Armenian. So, below we will only conventionally adhere to the usual practice of using the term “optative” to avoid terminological confusion (For a detailed discussion of the issue, see **S. Avetyan**, *Arewelahayereni bayi yelənakneri abelyanakan meknabanut'yunə, ditarkvac ardi lezvabanut'yan tesankyunic'* [Abelyan's Interpretation of Verb Moods in Eastern Armenian, Considered from the Viewpoint of Modern Linguistics] // Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut'yun [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2024, Vol. 3, SP1, pp., 34-44.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. **A. Aytənean**, *K'nnakan K'erakanut'iwn ašxarhabar kam ardi hayerēn lezui* [A Critical Grammar of the Ašxarhabar or Modern Armenian language], Vienna, 1866, pp. 449, 453, 459-460; **A. Abrahamyān**, *Grabari jeřnark* [A manual of Grabar], Yerevan, 1976, pp. 153-157; **P. Šarabxāyan**, *Grabari dasynt'ac'* [A Course of Grabar], Yerevan, 1974, pp. 187-188; **H. Jensen**, *Altarmenische Grammatik*, Heidelberg, 1959, S. 101.

<sup>4</sup> **S. Avetyan**, Main factors conditioning the absence of the final *p/r* and the origin of the final *h/i* of the Imperative singular in Armenian dialects. // Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut'yun [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2023. № 1, pp. 68-78.

former *t* /e/ and *h* /i/ conjugations have merged into a single conjugation type in the dialects concerned.

It is also significant that by the Middle Armenian period, the final *t* /ē/ of the 2 sg. imperative - which originally formed part of the aorist stem - came to be conceived of as an actual ending of the imperative, added to the present stem. The same is true for the final *w* /a/ of the 2 sg. imperative in the *w* /a/ conjugation. This is evidenced by some analogical forms of the 2 sg. imperative, built upon the present stem secondarily in Middle Armenian, e.g. *դնել* /dnem/ “to put”, 2 sg. impv. *դնէ* /dnē/ “put!”, *բանալ* /banam/ “to open”, 2 sg. impv. *բանալ* /bana/ “open!”, *լվանալ* /ivanam/ “to wash”, 2 sg. impv. *լվանալ* /ivana/ “wash!”, etc.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the ending *-hp* /-ir/ of the 2 sg. medio-passive imperative, which was only occasionally used with simple verbs of the *h* /i/ conjugation in Classical Armenian, takes over in Middle Armenian, displacing the original endingless form of the imperative, cf. Cl. Arm. *խուիս* /xōsim/ “to speak”, 2 sg. impv. *խուես* /xōsea'c/ “speak!”, Middle Arm. 2 sg. impv. *խուեցիպ* /xōsec'i r/ “speak!”, etc.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, simple verbs of the *h* /i/ conjugation have come to form the 2 sg. imperative in New Armenian not from the aorist stem as they did formerly, but from the present stem (cf. Middle Arm. 2 sg. impv. *խուեցիպ* /xōsec'i r/ “speak!” and New Arm. 2 sg. impv. *խու-իպ* /xōsi r/ “speak!”), the latter formation type being obviously analogical after the 2 sg. imperative of simple verbs of the *t* /e/ and *w* /a/ conjugations. Later, the ending *-hp* /-ir/ was also extended to the 2 sg. imperative of simple verbs of the *t* /e/ conjugation in certain dialects due to analogical extension<sup>7</sup>.

Of course, one should consider that the coalescence of simple verbs from the former *t* /e/ and *h* /i/ conjugations into a single conjugation has not occurred in all modern Armenian dialects, nor to the same extent. In addition, the directionality of analogical (and phonetic) changes during the process of merging has also varied across dialects. In general, three main lines of development are observable: 1) in several dialects, the morphological distinction in the formation of the 2 sg. imperative between the *t* /e/ and *h* /i/ conjugational classes has been preserved, which survives synchronically as an opposition between the ending *-t* /-ē/ (< Cl. Arm. stem-final diphthong *ես* /ea/) and *-hp* /-ir/ (< Cl. Arm. ending *-իպ* /-ir/) or their further modifications; 2) in other dialects, simple verbs of the *t* /ē/ (<*t* /e/) conjugation acquired the ending *-hp* /-ir/ in the 2 sg. imperative by analogy with simple verbs of the *h* /i/ conjugation; 3) in still other dialects, conversely, the 2 sg. imperative marker *-t* /ē/ of simple verbs in the *t* /e/ conjugation was extended analogically to simple verbs of the former *h* /i/ conjugation<sup>8</sup>. Moreover, the Classical

<sup>5</sup> J. Karst, Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen, Strassburg, 1901, SS. 334-335, 338, Anm.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 338. This is also true for the final *w* /a/ of the 2 sg. imperative in the *w* /a/ conjugation.

<sup>7</sup> S. Avetyan, Main factors conditioning the absence of the final *p* /r/..., pp. 68-78.

<sup>8</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the issue, see ibid., pp. 68-78.

Armenian stem-final diphthong *ɛw* /ea/ in the 2 sg. imperative underwent twofold further changes in some dialects, depending on the placement of the stress. For example, in the dialect of Agulis, which places the stress on the penultimate syllable, the Cl. Arm. *ɛw* /ea/ has yielded *ɛ/ē* in the accented position and *w/a* in the unaccented one. Thus, we see, on one hand, forms such as *qyrhł* /gyril/ (< *qnbł* /grel/) “to write”, 2 sg. impv. *qyrł́* /gyrē/ “write!”, *łunrhł* /ktril/ (< *łunrbł* /ktrel/) “to cut”, 2 sg. impv. *łunrł́* /ktrē/ “cut!”, and *łunrhł* /nstil/ (< *łunrbł* /nstel/) “to sit down”, 2 sg. impv. *łunrł́* /nstē/ “sit down!”, and on the other hand, forms like *łuwrhł* /xabil/ (< *łuwrbł* /xabel/) “to deceive”, 2 sg. impv. *łuwrẃ* /xaba/ “deceive!”, and *psalhł* /t'akil/ (< *psalbł* /t'akel/) “to knock”, 2 sg. impv. *psalẃ* /t'aka/ “knock!”, etc.<sup>9</sup> However, not all instances of the *w/a* vowel-final imperative forms of simple verbs of the *ɛ/h* /ē/i/ (< Cl. Arm. *ɛ* /e/ and *h* /i/) conjugation in modern Armenian dialects can be accounted for in this way. Various analogical and phonetic processes appear to have given rise to such forms.

In this respect, first of all, a clear distinction should be made between two groups of verbs. The first group comprises verbs that have historically been transferred to the *w/a* conjugation type in many dialects. These verbs are conjugated in nearly all forms, including the 2 sg. imperative, the same way as simple verbs of the *w/a* conjugation. For example, consider, on one hand, the verb *մընալ* /mənal/ (< Cl. Arm. *մնալ* /mnal/, *-uul* /-am/) “to stay”, with its forms: aor. *մընացի* /mənac'i/ “I stayed”, *մընացիր* /mənac'ir/ “you stayed”, *մընաց* /mənac/ “he/she stayed”..., 2 sg. impv. *մընա* /məna/ “stay!”, and on the other hand, such verbs as *ծիծաղալ* /cicałal/ “to laugh”, *խուսալ* /xōsal/ “to speak” (< Cl. Arm. *ծիծաղել* /cicałel/, *-hul* /-im/, *խուել* /xōsel/, *-hul* /-im/, respectively), aor. *ծիծաղցի* /cicałac'i/ “I laughed”, *ծիծաղցիր* /cicałac'ir/ “you laughed”, *ծիծաղց* /cicałac/ “he/she laughed”..., *խուսացի* /xōsac'i/ “I spoke”, *խուսացիր* /xōsac'ir/ “you spoke”, *խուսաց* /xōsac/ “he/she spoke”..., 2 sg. impv. *ծիծաղու* /cicała/ “laugh!”, *խուս* /xōsa/ “speak!”, etc.<sup>10</sup> To our surprise, however, some dialectologists traditionally assign verbs such as *ծիծաղալ* /cicałal/, “to laugh” and *խուսալ* /xōsal/ “to speak” to the group of simple verbs of the *ɛ/ē* conjugation rather than the *w/a* conjugation, and they do so without any justification<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> For the cited forms, see **S. Sargeanc'**, Agulec'oc' barbařə (zōkeri lezun): lezuabanakan hetazötut'iwn [The dialect of Agulis: a linguistic study]. Vols. 1–2, Moscow, 1883, pp. 119–120, also pp. 34, 49–52, 108–109.

<sup>10</sup> Cf., for example, Ošakan gyuł, Hayereni barbařagitan atlasi antip nyut'er (henceforth HBAAN) [Village Oshakan, Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas (henceforth UMADA)], tetr № 20, points 631–633, 641, 644; Aštarak k'ałak', HBAAN [Town Aštarak, UMADA], tetr № 151, points 632–633, 641; Mułni gyuł, HBAAN [Village Mułni, UMADA], tetr № 44, points 632–633, 641; Elvard, HBAAN [Elvard, UMADA], tetr № 86, points 632–633, 641; K'anak'ef gyuł, HBAAN [Village K'anak'ef, UMADA], tetr № 230, points 632–633, 641.

<sup>11</sup> Cf., for example, Ošakan gyuł..., points 632–633, 641; Aštarak k'ałak'..., points 632–633, 641; Mułni gyuł..., points 632–633, 641; Elvard..., points 632–633, 641; K'anak'ef gyuł..., points 632–633, 641, etc.

The second group includes verbs that have normally retained the *է/ē* (< Cl. Arm. *է/e* and *ի/i*) conjugation type in all verb forms, with one exception: the new 2 sg. imperative, which ends in *-ս/a* (e.g., inf. *բընէլ* /bərnēl/ “to catch, to hold”, 2 sg. impv. *բընս* /bərnā/ “catch!, hold!”, inf. *կըղըլ* /kədrēl/ “to cut”, 2 sg. impv. *կըղրս* /kədra/ “cut!”, inf. *սիրէլ* /sirēl/ “to love”, 2 sg. impv. *սիրս* /sira/ “love!”, inf. *ուզէլ* /uzēl/ “to want”, 2 sg. impv. *ուզս* /uzā/ “want!”, etc.)<sup>12</sup>, thereby coinciding with the respective form of simple verbs in the *ս/ա* conjugation. However, the *ս/ա* vowel-final imperative forms within the second group mentioned above are not all homogeneous either. Specifically, one should distinguish the outcomes of regular phonetic changes from those having arisen due to analogical changes.

### Dialectal *ս/ա* Vowel-Final Imperative Forms

#### Due to the Regular Sound Change of *ես/ea* to *ս/ա*

As stated above, in the dialect of Agulis, the Classical Armenian diphthong *ես* has been monophthongized to *է* in the accented syllable and to *ս* in the unaccented one. This is also true for the dialect of Karčewan<sup>13</sup>, while in the dialect of Kak‘avaberd, the phonetic change *ես/ea* > *ս/ա* has regularly taken place in both accented and unaccented syllables. For example, *իւսիլ* /xəmi'l/ (< *իւմէլ* /xmēl/) “to drink”, 2g. impv. *իւսս* /xəmā/ “drink!”, and *դարկիլ* /tārkil/ (< *դարկլիլ* /ularkel/) “to send”, 2 sg. impv. *դարկս* /tārka/ “send!”, etc.<sup>14</sup> Yet, in the dialect of Arabkir, the Classical Armenian diphthong *ես/ea* appears to have changed to *ս/ա* via the transitional stage of *է/ē*. One should note that the diphthong *ես/ea* typically yields *է/ē* in the Arabkir dialect, as evidenced by forms such as *կորեակ* /koreak/ > *կորէկ* /korēk/, *ցորեան* /c'orean/ > *ցորէն* /c'orēn/ “wheat”, etc.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, the vowel *է/ē* has regularly changed to *ս/ա* in final position not only in the 3 sg. present indicative, optative and subjunctive (all three going back to the Classical Armenian present indicative), but in some independent words and proper nouns as well, for example, *ուտէլ* /utel/ “to eat”, 3 sg. present indicative *կուտսն նը* /kutā nə/ “he/she eats”, *իւլէլ* /xmēl/ “to drink”, 3 sg. present indicative *կուլսն նը* /xmā nə/ “he/she drinks”, *Հեղինէ* /Helinē/ > *Հեղնս* /Helna/, *Այշէլ* /Ayišē/ > *Այշշս* /Ayišā/, etc.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, considering that the further development of the newly originated vowel *է/ē* (< Cl. Arm. *ես/ea*) has been precisely identical to that of the inherited Cl. Arm. *է/ē* in the dialect of

<sup>12</sup> Cf., Ošakan gyuł..., points 641; P'arpi, HBAAN [P'arpi, UMADA], tetr № 9, points 641; Aštarak k'ałak'..., points 641; Ełvard..., points 641.

<sup>13</sup> **H. Muradyan**, Karčewani barbařa [The dialect of Karčewan], Yerevan., 1960, pp. 46, 130-136.

<sup>14</sup> **H. Muradyan**, Kak‘avaberdī barbařa [The dialect of Kak‘avaberd], Yerevan, 1967, pp. 62-63, 138-140.

<sup>15</sup> **Melik‘ S. Dawit‘-Bék**, Arabkiri gawařabarbařa: jaynabanakan ew k'érakanakan usumnasiru'iwn [The dialect of Arabkir: a phonetic and grammatical study], Vienna, 1919, pp. 129-130.

<sup>16</sup> For the cited forms, see ibid., pp. 118-119, 259.

Arabkir, it seems quite reasonable to think that the final *u* /ä/ in the 2 sg. imperative of simple verbs of the *k* /e/ conjugation (cf. *jułtł* /xmel/ “to drink”, 2 sg. impv. *jułuł* /xmä/ “drink!”)<sup>17</sup> has also arisen through the regular sound change *kaw* /ea/ > *k* /e/ > *u* /ä/. The evidence from the above three dialects exemplifies the *u* /a/ vowel-final imperative forms that resulted from either a conditioned or an unconditioned regular sound change.

### Dialectal *u* /a/ Vowel-Final Imperative Forms Due to the Analogical Influence from Three High-Frequency Transitive Verbs

As for the analogical change, this appears to be the case with the following instances. Some subdialects within the dialect of Ararat have an important peculiarity: an *u* /a/ vowel-final rather than *h* /i/ vowel-final form in the 2 sg. imperative of transitive simple verbs of the *k* /e/ (< Cl. Arm. *k* /e/ and *h* /i/) conjugation. H. Ačaryan, when exemplifying the 2 sg. imperative of the *k* /e/ conjugation simple verbs in the dialect of Yerevan or Ararat<sup>18</sup>, adduces the doublets *uhph* /uhpu/ 'siri' /sira' “love!”<sup>19</sup>. He further notes that “the second form of the imperative, which has the ending *u* /a/, is peculiar to the Ējmian region, e.g., *niqui* /uza/ “want!”, *qunui* /vara/ “ignite!”, “light!”, etc., whereas the dialect of Erevan proper employs *niqh* /uzi/, *qunh* /vari/..., etc”<sup>20</sup>. However, H. Ačaryan doesn’t specify whether all simple verbs of the *k* /e/ (< Cl. Arm. *k* /e/ and *h* /i/) conjugation in the subdialect of Ējmian show the ending *u* /a/ in the 2 sg. imperative. Moreover, he doesn’t touch on the question of the origin of the form under consideration. Other dialectologists either have overlooked the issue altogether<sup>21</sup> or have simply stated, following H. Ačaryan, that the 2 sg. imperative of simple verbs of the *k* /e/ (< *k* /e/ and *h* /i/) conjugation, is usually formed with the ending *h* /i/ in the dialect of Ararat, and only in some subdialects with the help of the ending *u* /a/<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 259.

<sup>18</sup> In Armenian dialectology, the terms “the dialect of Yerevan” and “the dialect of Ararat” are often used interchangeably (cf., for example, **A. Łaribyan**, Hay barbařagtit'yun: hnč'yunabunut'yun ew jewabanut'yun [Armenian dialectology: phonology and morphology], Yerevan, 1953, p. 218).

<sup>19</sup> See **H. Ačaryan**, Hay barbařagtit'iwn: uruagic ew dasaworut'iwn hay barbařneri [Armenian dialectology: A sketch and classification of Armenian dialects], Moskua: Nor-Naxijewan, (Ēminean azgagrakan zołovacu, vol. 8), 1911, p. 43.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>21</sup> Cf., for example, **A. Łaribyan**, op. cit., pp. 225-227; **M. Asatryan**, Hay barbařagtit'yan gorcnakan ašxatank'neri jeřnark [A Manual of practical works of Armenian dialectology], Yerevan, 1985, p 128.

<sup>22</sup> See, for example, **A. Grigoryan**, Hay barbařagtit'yan dasənt'ac' [A handbook of Armenian dialectology], Yerevan, 1957, p. 217, 220-221. Cf. also **V. Katvalyan**, Bayazeti barbařa ew nra lezvakan arnč'ut'yunnerə šrjaka barbařneri het [The dialect of Bayazet and its linguistic relationships with surrounding dialects], Yerevan, 2016, p. 140.

In our view, analogical influence from three high-frequency transitive verbs, namely, *uuł* /asēl/ “to say”, 2 sg. impv. *uuui* /asa/ “say!”, *uðł* /acēl/ (originally meaning “to bring, to adduce!”, later “to fill”), 2 sg. impv. *uðui* /aca/ (originally meaning “bring!, adduce!”, later “fill!”), *uñł* /anēl/ “to do”, 2 sg. impv. *uƿui* /ara/ “do!”, is quite likely to have been responsible for the appearance of the form in question. Therefore, it is no accident that only transitive simple verbs of the *ł* /ē/ conjugation usually display the ending *u* /a/ in the 2 sg. imperative, whereas intransitive ones in the same conjugation class have regularly preserved the standard ending *h* /i/. To put it another way, analogical extension appears to have been the most plausible motivation for the remodelling of the 2 sg. imperative of the *ł* /ē/ conjugation simple verbs, with the verb *uuł* /asēl/ having played a pivotal role in this process<sup>23</sup>. As is known, this verb, unlike other simple verbs of the *ł* /ē/ conjugation, featured a deviant form ending in the stem vowel *u* /a/ in the 2 sg. imperative, namely, *uuui* /asa/ “say!” (from the aorist stem *uuuug* /asac/ due to the prehistoric loss of the stem-final *g* /c/) already in Classical Armenian. Apart from this, the above analogical change may have been facilitated by the fact that the aorist of the verb *uuł* /asēl/, in its turn, has been reshaped by analogy with the *ł* /ē/ conjugation simple verbs in the dialect of Ararat and now it is conjugated regularly just as other simple verbs of the *ł* /ē/ conjugation, cf., for example, *uułg* /asēc/i/ “I said” – 1 sg. aor., *uułg* /asēc/ “he/she said” – 3 sg. aor., *uułghū* /asēc/in/ “they said” – 3 pl. aor. versus Cl. Arm. *uuuugh* /asac/i/, *uuuug* /asac/, *uuuughū* /asac/in/, respectively. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the 2 pl. imperative of the verb *uuł* /asēl/ has also been remade on the model of the *ł* /ē/ conjugation simple verbs in the dialect concerned (cf. *uułp* /asēk/ vs. Cl. Arm. *uuuugłp* /asac'ēk/), whereas the form of the 2 sg. imperative *uuui* /asa/ has remained intact<sup>24</sup>. Incidentally, the above situation is consistent with typological evidence, according to which the 2 sg. imperative is usually more resistant to analogical change due to a higher frequency of use than the 2 pl. imperative, which frequently and more readily undergoes analogical change and morphological restructuring<sup>25</sup>.

### Dialectal *u* /a/ Vowel-Final Imperative Forms Due to the Joint Effect of Analogical Change and Articulatory Weakening

We assume that analogical change also accounts for the emergence of a similar *u* /a/ vowel-final form of the 2 sg. imperative in the dialect of Bayazet, although V.

<sup>23</sup> For more information on the issue, see **S. Avetyan**, On One Important Peculiarity of the Imperative Singular in the Dialect of Ararat // Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut'yun [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2023, № 3, pp. 30-38.

<sup>24</sup> See *ibid.* for a more detailed discussion of the issue.

<sup>25</sup> **A. Y. Aikhenvald**, Imperatives and Commands, Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 339-351, 362-364. Cf. also **J. Bybee**, Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language, Oxford University Press, 2007, Introduction, pp. 10-11, Ch. 3, pp. 41-69; **M. Haspelmath, A. D. Sims**, Understanding Morphology, 2nd ed., Hodder Education, An Hachette UK Company, 2010, pp. 273-276.

Katvalyan attributes it to an articulatorily conditioned sound change of *եւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/<sup>26</sup>. However, he does not provide compelling evidence to support the alleged phonetic development of *եւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/ in the dialect of Bayazet; the only examples adduced by V. Katvalyan to illustrate the supposed sound change of *եւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/ are *հիրար* /hirar/ (< *իրեար* /irear/) “each other, to each other” and *լուսնակ* /lusnak/ (< *լուսնեակ* /lusneak/) “moon” along with 2 sg. imperative forms such as *գրեա՛* /grea՛/ > *գրաւ* /gəra/ “write!”, etc. At the same time, he admits that the phonetic development of *եւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/ is a deviation from the sound change of *եւ* /ea/ to *է* /e/, which is typical of the Bayazet dialect<sup>27</sup>. We also failed to find any forms that would unequivocally confirm the claimed sound change of *եւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/ in this dialect. As for the words *հիրար* /hirar/ and *լուսնակ* /lusnak/, the following should be taken into consideration. The exceptional sound change of *եւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/, instead of the expected change to *է/է՛/ե/է՛* in the case of the reciprocal pronoun *իրեար* /irear/), as well as in a few other individual words, is characteristic of many modern Armenian dialects—even those that have consistently undergone the sound change of *եւ* /ea/ to *է/է՛/ե/է՛*<sup>28</sup>. Similarly, forms such as *լուսնակ* /lusnak/, *լուսնագ* /lusnag/, *լիսնակ* /lisnak/, *լիսնակ* /liusnak/ “moon” also occur in a number of modern Armenian dialects<sup>29</sup>. What is more important is that they are most frequently traced back to the Classical Armenian form *լուսնակ* /lusnak/ rather than *լուսնեակ* /lusneak/<sup>30</sup>. Therefore, the words *հիրար* /hirar/ and *լուսնակ* /lusnak/ cannot be viewed as sufficient evidence in support of the alleged sound change of *եւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/ in the 2 sg. imperative form in the dialect of Bayazet.

Interestingly, in the dialect of Bayazet, the *ւ* /a/ vowel-final imperative form coincides, on one hand, with the 3 sg. optative of the *է* /e/ conjugation simple verbs, and on the other hand, with the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb *ել* /em/ “to be”. Regarding the historical relationships between the three forms, V. Katvalyan assumes that the articulatorily conditioned sound change *եւ* /ea/ > *ւ* /a/ occurred in the 2 sg. imperative and was then analogically extended to the 3 sg. optative, and from there to

<sup>26</sup> V. Katvalyan, op. cit., pp. 407-410.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 140.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. H. Ačaryan, K'nnut'iwn Nor-Jułayi barbaři [Study of the dialect of Nor-Juł], Yerevan, 1940, pp. 84, 364; M. Asatryan, Lorū xosvack'ə [The subdialect of Lor], Yerevan, 1968, p. 59; T. Danielyan, Malat'iai barbařə [The dialect of Malat'ia], Yerevan, 1967, pp. 41, 107; B. Mežunc', Šamšadin-Dilijani xosvack'ə [The subdialect of Šamšadin-Dilijan], Yerevan, 1989, pp. 23-24, 72, among many others.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. H. Ačaryan, Hayerēn armatakan bařaran [Armenian root dictionary], in 4 vols (2nd edn.), Yerevan, 1971-1979, Vol. 2, p. 296.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. H. Ačaryan, K'nnut'yun Vani barbaři [Study of the dialect of Van], Yerevan, 1952, p. 264. Cf. also Nor baigirk' haykazean lezui [New Dictionary of the Armenian language], Vol., 1-2, (Venetik, 1836-1837), Vol. 1, pp. 902-903, particularly with regard to the semantic aspects of the Classical Armenian words *լուսնակ* /lusnak/ and *լուսնեակ* /lusneak/.

the 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary<sup>31</sup>. However, in the light of the data presented above, this assumption seems at least questionable. Rather, a sound change of *Է/է/* to *Ո/ա/* (due to an articulatory weakening in muscular tension, see below) is likely to have occurred in the 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb *ԷՄ/էմ/*, which is primarily used enclitically in affirmative conjugated forms in modern Armenian dialects, as well as in Modern Literary Armenian, as opposed to the negative forms of the auxiliary, which usually carry the stress. For example, in colloquial Modern Eastern Armenian we see, on one hand, forms such as *զնն իմ ա/* (< *զնն իմ է/*) “he/she goes, he/she is going”, *սիր իմ ա/* (< *սիր իմ է/*) “he/she loves”, etc., and on the other hand, the respective negative forms with the stressed auxiliary, such as *չ զնն չ ի գնմ/* “he/she doesn’t go, he/she is not going”, *չ սիր չ ի սիրմ/* “he/she doesn’t love”, etc.

H. Acharyan, when describing various manifestations of the conjugated forms of the auxiliary verb *ԷՄ/էմ/* in modern Armenian dialects, notes that the motivation for the change of the 3 sg. present from *Է/է/* to *Ո/ա/* is not clear<sup>32</sup>. However, in dealing with the relevant evidence from the dialect of Jugha, he states that in the negative forms of the auxiliary verb, the presence of the prefix *չ/չ’/* and the stress falling on the vowel *Է/է/* have contributed to the retention of that vowel, hindering the change of *Է/է/* to *Ո/ա/* (cf. *չէմ/*, *չէս/*, *չի/չ’ի/*, *չէնկ/*, *չէկ/*, *չէն/*). This has not been the case in the respective affirmative unstressed forms, which exhibit the vowel *Ո/ա/* throughout the paradigm (cf. *ամ/*, *աս/*, *ա/ա/*, *անկ/*, *ակ/էկ/*, *ան/*)<sup>33</sup>. Moreover, H. Acharyan rightly observes that, in this case, as well as in several other dialects, the vowel *Ո/ա/* has been extended analogically from the 3 sg. present form to the other persons within the paradigm<sup>34</sup>. What is more important in H. Acharyan’s observation mentioned above is that he implicitly acknowledges that the change of *Է/է/* to *Ո/ա/* has, in principle, only been possible in unstressed positions, which, in its turn, suggests that this process can be viewed as an articulatory weakening in a certain sense.

Note, in this respect, that in many languages, high vowels are often produced with greater tension in the tongue and sometimes the lips, resulting in a more constricted vocal tract. This is why high vowels often sound more “tense” or “tight” than lower vowels, which are articulated with a more relaxed tongue position and a more open mouth. In this sense, the shift from a relatively higher and closer vowel

<sup>31</sup> V. Katvalyan, op. cit., p. 407-410.

<sup>32</sup> H. Աշարյան, Liakatar k’erakanut’yun hayoc’ lezvi [Complete grammar of the Armenian language], Vol. 4, Part 2, Yerevan, 1961, p. 64.

<sup>33</sup> H. Աշարյան, K’nmut’iwn Nor-Juլayi..., pp. 245, 275.

<sup>34</sup> H. Աշարյան, Liakatar k’erakanut’yun..., p. 65.

to a lower and more open one, especially in unstressed syllables, may be regarded as a kind of articulatory weakening in muscular tension.

It should be noted that the change of the 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb from *Է/է/* to *ա/ա/* is typical of many, but not all, modern Armenian dialects<sup>35</sup>. On the other hand, there is a common tendency observed in most modern Armenian dialects: the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb usually contains a lower (more open) vowel compared to the forms of the other persons in the affirmative conjugation. Specifically, the difference in vowel quality between the third person singular present and other persons is manifested as follows: *ի/ի/ – Է/է/ (իմ/ ‘I am’, իս/ ‘you are’, Է/է/ ‘he/she is’*, in the dialect of Tbilisi as well as in some other dialects); *Է/է/ – ա/ա/ (էմ/ ‘I am’, էս/ ‘you are’, ա/ա/ ‘he/she is’*, in the dialects of Ararat and Astraxan); *է/է/ – ա/ա/ (էմ/ ‘I am’, էս/ ‘you are’, ա/ա/ ‘he/she is’*, in the dialect of Bayazet); *ը/օ/ – ա/ա/ (ըմ/ ‘I am’, ըօ/ ‘you are’, ա/ա/ ‘he/she is’*, in the dialects of Larabat and Agulis); *ի/ի/ – ը/օ/ (իմ/ ‘I am’, իս/ ‘you are’, ը/օ/ ‘he/she is’*, in the dialect of Kilikia), etc.<sup>36</sup> This evidence seems to suggest that, all else being equal, the final open syllable more readily favours the articulatory weakening (as clarified above) of an unstressed vowel compared to the closed one.

Moreover, as we have already seen, the vowel *ա/ա/*, which presumably arose from *Է/է/* due to an articulatory weakening in muscular tension in the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb, was later analogically extended to the other persons, thus being generalized throughout the paradigm by the principle of analogical levelling in some dialects<sup>37</sup>. As for the dialect of Bayazet, as stated above, analogical extension here appears to have proceeded from the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb *էմ/* to the 3 sg. optative of transitive simple verbs in the *է/է/* conjugation, and from there to the 2 sg. imperative.

As is known, there has been an intense analogical interplay between the present-tense paradigm of the auxiliary verb *էմ/* and that of verbs in the *է/է/* conjugation already in pre-written Armenian, with the result that both paradigms are identical in terms of conjugational endings in Classical Armenian<sup>38</sup> (cf. *էմ/ ‘I am’, էս/ ‘you (sg.) are’, է/է/ ‘he/she/it is’, էմէ/ ‘we are’, էէ/ ‘you (pl.) are’, էն/ ‘they are’, and *պէն-էմ/* ‘berem/ ‘I bring’, *պէն-էս/* ‘you (sg.) bring’, *պէն-է/* ‘he/she/it brings’, *պէն-էմէ/* ‘we bring’, *պէն-էէ/* ‘you (pl.) bring’, *պէն-էն/* ‘they bring’). The close morphological*

<sup>35</sup> **G. Jahukyan**, Hay barbaragtit‘yan neracut‘yun: vičakagrakan barbaragtit‘yun [Introduction to Armenian dialectology: statistic dialectology], Yerevan, 1972, pp. 101, 108-109. Cf. also **V. Katvalyan**, op. cit., p. 407.

<sup>36</sup> See **V. Katvalyan**, op. cit., p. 408.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. **H. Ačaryan**, Liakatar k‘erakanut‘yun..., p. 65.

<sup>38</sup> **H. Ačaryan**, Liakatar k‘erakanut‘yun hayoc‘ lezvi [Complete grammar of the Armenian language], Vol. 4, Part 1, Yerevan, 1959, pp. 371-372, **R. Godel**, op. cit., p. 118.

relationship and formal similarity between the two paradigms have generally been preserved in the further history of the Armenian language, showing up in many modern Armenian dialects, especially in the negative conjugation, even after the Classical Armenian present indicative developed into a subjunctive (traditionally termed “optative”). Of course, the aforementioned articulatory weakening in the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb, when used enclitically in the affirmative conjugation, has somewhat disrupted the formal relationship between the two paradigms in a number of dialects<sup>39</sup>. Nonetheless, both paradigms resemble each other in many dialects as well as in Modern Literary Armenian, having often undergone various additional sound changes (*է* /e/ > *ի* /i/<sup>40</sup>, *է* /ē/ > *ի/լ* /i/ə/<sup>41</sup>, *է* /e/ > *լ* /ə/<sup>42</sup>, etc.), or having been preserved intact in a largely parallel manner. Therefore, it is no surprise that speakers (language users) of the Bayazet dialect have tried to eliminate the only formal difference between the two paradigms through the analogical extension of the vowel *ւ* /a/ from the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb to the 3 sg. of the optative.

Interestingly, in the dialect of Bayazet, only transitive verbs of the *է* /e/ conjugation typically follow the aforementioned pattern for forming the 3 sg. optative and the 2 sg. imperative, while intransitive, as well as passive, verbs exhibit a final vowel *ի* /i/ instead of *ւ* /a/ in these forms. Accordingly, we see, on one hand, forms such as 3 sg. opt. *զ պահ /գ’ ար* “I wish he would write”, “let him/her write”, 3 sg. pres. *ւ* /a/ “he/she/it is”, 2 sg. impv. *զ պահ /գ’ ար* “write!”, and on the other

<sup>39</sup> In this respect, it should be noted that forms of the other persons of the auxiliary verb, when used enclitically, have also often undergone sound changes distinct from the respective forms of the optative in several dialects.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. **T. Danielyan**, op. cit., pp. 114-115, also p. 120.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. **M. Asatryan**, Urmiayi (Xoyi) barbarə [The dialect of Urmia (Xoy)], Yerevan, 1962, pp. 103, 107.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. **V. Petoyan**, Sasuni barbarə [The dialect of Sasun], Yerevan, 1954, pp. 44-45, 62. In the dialect of Sasun, the sound change *է* /e/ > *լ* /ə/ is not likely to have resulted from an articulatory weakening in view of the fact that the same change has also affected the negative conjugation with the stressed vowel *է* /e/, as well as personal pronouns, e.g. *չլու/չ’ամ/* (< *չէլու/չ’ամ/*), *չլու/չ’ա՛ս/* (< *չէլու/չ’ա՛ս/*), *չլու/չ’ե՛լ/*, *մէլու/մենկ’/* (< *մէլու/մենկ’/*), *մլու/մօր/* (< *մէլու/մեր/*), *ծլու/ծօր/* (< *ծէլու/յեր/*), etc. (Cf. ibid., pp. 17, 47 ff.). On the other hand, in the 3 sg. of the auxiliary verb, the affirmative conjugation shows a change from *է* /ē/ to *մ* (=ü) due to an articulatory weakening. In the other forms of the affirmative paradigm, the vowel *լ* /ə/ occurs, with the exception of the 2 pl. form, which shows the vowel *է* /ē/ (specifically, these forms are *լլու/əմ/*, *լլու/ə՛ս/*, *մ/ə/*, *լլու/əկ’/*, *լլու/էկ’/*, *լլու/əն/*) (for the cited forms, see ibid., p. 62). The comparison of this paradigm with that of the optative, where the vowel *է* /ē/ occurs in both the 3 sg. and 2 pl. forms, while all other persons exhibit the vowel *լ* /ə/ (e.g. *լլու/էրմ/* (< *զլու/գրեմ/*), *լլու/էրա/* (< *զլու/գրես/*), *լլէ/էրէ/* (< *զլէ/գրէ/*), *լլու/էրէ՛կ/* (< *զլու/գրէ՛կ/*), *լլու/էրէ՛ք/* (< *զլու/գրէ՛ք/*), *լլու/էրէ՛ն/* (< *զլու/գրէ՛ն/*) (for the cited forms, see ibid., p. 47), clearly shows that earlier both paradigms were identical regarding the conjugational endings. However, the later change of *է* /ē/ to *մ* (=ü) due to an articulatory weakening partially disrupted the formal correspondence between the two paradigms. Note also that, otherwise, the vowel *է* /ē/ usually doesn't undergo any sound changes in the dialect of Sasun (cf. ibid., p. 17).

hand, forms like 3 sg. opt. *q'ppuψh/g'ərvi/* “I wish he/she/it would be written”, “let him/her/it be written”, *նրսոψh/nəsti/* “I wish he/she/it would sit down”, “let him/her/it sit down”, 2 sg. impv. *q'ppuψh/g'ərvi/* “be written!”, *նրսոψh/nəsti/* “sit down”, etc.<sup>43</sup> From a synchronic perspective, it may seem strange that the 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb (which is intransitive) coincides with the 3 sg. optative (originally present indicative) of transitive verbs, rather than intransitive verbs, in terms of the conjugational vowel. However, one should consider that in Classical Armenian, the *է/e/* conjugation was not restricted to transitive verbs; it included both transitive and intransitive verbs. Only later, in several dialects, was the *է/e/* conjugation primarily assigned to transitive verbs. In contrast, intransitive verbs have retained the characteristic conjugational vowel *հ/i/* of the previous *հ/i/* conjugation type, mainly in the 3 sg. optative and in the respective forms of other moods that are synchronically built upon the optative, and also frequently in the 2 sg. imperative<sup>44</sup>. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that in the dialect of Bayazet, the auxiliary verb has simply maintained the original *է/e/* conjugation due to its high frequency of use. This is also the case with the dialects of Tigranakert and Yerznka, where a similar contrast between active and medio-passive conjugation types—related to a synchronic distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs—is manifested through the opposition of corresponding conjugational vowels (namely, *է/է/ : հ/i/*), and again the conjugation of the auxiliary verb aligns with that of transitive verbs<sup>45</sup>.

As for the formal correspondence between the 3 sg. optative and 2 sg. imperative in the *է/e/* conjugation in the dialect of Bayazet, we have already noted that the sound change of *էս/ea/* to *է/է/* in the 2 sg. imperative of verbs in the *է/e/* conjugation by the Middle Armenian period led to a formal coincidence of the two forms. As a consequence, the further history of both forms has generally been almost identical in the majority of dialectal areas with the result that their synchronic manifestations also largely coincide in many dialects. Lack of such formal correspondence in several dialects is mainly due to the fact that either the diphthong *էս/ea/* has undergone a sound change other than *էս/ea/ > է/է/* (for example, *էս/ea/ > ս/ա/*), or the ending *-hp/-ir/* of the Classical Armenian 2 sg. medio-passive imperative has been extended analogically from simple verbs of the *հ/i/* conjugation to those of the *է/e/* conjugation in the dialects concerned.<sup>46</sup> Another factor of no less importance in establishing a close formal relationship between the 3

<sup>43</sup> V. Katvalyan, op. cit., pp. 380-382, 408-409.

<sup>44</sup> Cf., for example, aside from the evidence adduced above from the dialect of Bayazet, also A. Haneyan, Tigranakerti barbařo [The dialect of Tigranakert], Yerevan, 1978, pp. 110, 112-113, 121; D. Kostandyan, Erznkayi barbařo [The dialect of Erznka], Yerevan, 1979, pp. 85-86, 105, 107, also p. 98, etc.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. A. Haneyan, op. cit., pp. 110, 121, 127; D. Kostandyan, op. cit., pp. 85-86, 98, 105, 107.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. S. Avetyan, Main factors conditioning the absence of the final *p/r/..., pp. pp. 68-78.*

sg. optative and the 2 sg. imperative was, without doubt, the fact that in Middle Armenian, as stated above, the stem-final vowels *է* /ē/ and *ւ* /a/ of the 2 sg. imperative in the *է* /e/ and *ւ* /a/ conjugations, respectively, were conceived as actual endings of the imperative, added to the present stem. Therefore, it is quite expected and reasonable that such a close formal relationship between the 3 sg. optative and the 2 sg. imperative might have triggered various analogical changes, leading to certain morphological restructuring of one of the forms by analogy with the other.

In the light of the evidence analyzed above, we are inclined to believe that the historical relationship between the three forms in question (namely, the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb *էլ* /em/, the 3 sg. optative and the 2 sg. imperative in the *է* /e/ conjugation) in the dialect of Bayazet can be explained as follows: a sound change from *է* /ē/ to *ւ* /a/ (due to an articulatory weakening in muscular tension) is likely to have occurred in the 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb *էլ* /em/, which is primarily used enclitically in affirmative conjugated forms in the dialect of Bayazet, as well as in other modern Armenian dialects. Then, the vowel *ւ* /a/ was analogically extended to the 3 sg. optative and from there to the 2 sg. imperative form of transitive verbs in the *է* /e/ conjugation. It should be noted that the dialect of Bayazet is not exceptional in this respect; a similar analogical process also appears to have occurred in the subdialect of Alashkert and the dialect of Diadin, where, again, the 2 sg. imperative form of transitive simple verbs in the *է* /e/ conjugation coincides, on one hand, with the 3 sg. optative, and on the other hand, with the 3 sg. present of the auxiliary verb *էլ* /em/. Meanwhile, the 2 sg. imperative, as well as the 3 sg. optative, of intransitive simple verbs in the same conjugation end in the vowel *ի* /i/.<sup>47</sup> Additionally, a similar phenomenon is observed in Ararat subdialects in the district of Hoktemberyan, possibly influenced by the dialect of Bayazet<sup>48</sup>.

To sum up, we can state that the *ւ* /a/ vowel-final imperative of simple verbs in the *է/ի* /ē/i / (< Classical Armenian *է* /e/ and *ի* /i/) conjugation in modern Armenian dialects has several different origins from various phonetic and analogical changes. Specifically, in some dialects the form in question has resulted from the regular sound change of *էւ* /ea/ to *ւ* /a/. In several subdialects within the dialect of Ararat, analogical influence from three high-frequency transitive verbs, namely, *սուլ* /asēl/ “to say”, 2 sg. impv. *սուսի* /asa/ “say!”, *սծլ* /acēl/ (originally meaning “to bring, to adduce! ”, later “to fill”), 2 sg. impv. *սծսի* /aca/ (originally meaning

<sup>47</sup> Cf. **K. Madat'yan**, Alaškerti xosvack'ə (Aparan-Aragaci tarack) [The subdialect of Alaškert], Yerevan, 1985, pp. 117-119, 122-126; **V. Xač'atryan**, Vardenisi (Diadini) barbařə [The dialect of Vardenis (Diadin)], Yerevan, 2004, pp. 82-85, also Diadini barbařə, HBAAN [The dialect of Diadin, UMADA], tetr № 8, point 641.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. **S. H. Baldasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan**, Araratyan barbaři xosvack'nerə Hoktemberyanı šrjanum [The Ararat subdialects in the district of Hoktemberyan], Yerevan, 1973, pp. 134, 139, 140. See also p. 5, 20-21.

“bring!, adduce!”, later “fill!”), *անէլ* /anēl/ “to do”, 2 sg. impv. *արա՛* /ara՛/ “do!”, is quite likely to have been responsible for the appearance of the form in question. In still other dialects, a sound change from *է /ē/* to *ա /a/* appears to have occurred in the enclitic 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb, likely due to an articulatory weakening in muscular tension. Later, the vowel *ա /a/* was extended through analogy from the 3 sg. present form of the auxiliary verb to the 3 sg. optative, and from there to the 2 sg. imperative.

**ՍԱՐԳԻՍ ԱՎԵՏՅԱՆ – Հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառներում Ե/ի խոնարհման պարզ բայերի ա ձայնավորահանգ հրամայականի մի քանի տարրէր ծագումները – Հոդվածում փորձ է արվում ցույց տալ, որ հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառներում Ե/ի խոնարհման պարզ բայերի ա ձայնավորահանգ հրամայականի ձևերը ունեն մի քանի ծագում: Մասնավորապես, հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառների համապատասխան փաստերի համաժամանակյա և տարածամանակյա վերլուծությունը թույլ է տալիս առանձնացնել երեք հիմնական զարգացումներ, որոնք հանգեցրել են տվյալ ձևերի ծագմանը. 1) որոշ բարբառներում (օր.՝ Ազուլիսի, Կարձևանի և Կարավարերինի) հրամայականի այդ ձևը *և* > *ա* օրինաչափ հնչյունափոխության արդյունք է, 2) Արարատյան բարբարի որոշ խոսվածքներում տվյալ ձևը մեծ հավանականությամբ առաջացել է բարձր կիրառահաճախականություն ունեցող երեք անցողական բայերի (այն է՝ *ասէլ*, հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ. *ասա*, *ածէլ* (որը սկզբնապես նշանակել է «քշէլ, բերել», իսկ հետագայում՝ «լցնել»), հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ. *ածա*, *անէլ*, հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ. *արա՛*) համարանական ազդեցությամբ, ընդ որում *ասէլ* բայց առանցքային դեր է խաղացել այդ գործընթացում, 3) իսկ մի շարք այլ բարբառներում (օր.՝ Բայազետի և Դիաղինի բարբառներում, ինչպես նաև Ալաշկերտի խոսվածքում) հավանական է թվում, որ *և* օժանդակ բայի ներկա եզ. 3-րդ դ. վերջահար ձևը *է* > *ա* հնչյունափոխության է ենթարկվել մկանային լարվածության արտասանական թուլացման հետևանքով: Հետագայում այդ *ա* ձայնավորը օժանդակ բայի ներկա եզ. 3-րդ դ. ձևից համարանությամբ տարածվել է է խոնարհման բայերի լրձական եզ. 3-րդ դ. ձևի, իսկ այնտեղից է՝ հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ. ձևի վրա:**

**Բանալի բառեր — ա ձայնավորահանգ հրամայականի ձևը, հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառներ, համարանական ազդեցություն, բարձր կիրառահաճախականություն ունեցող անցողական բայեր, է > *ա* հնչյունափոխություն, արտասանական թուլացում, հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ.**

**САРГИС АВЕТЯН – Несколько различных происхождений формы императива с конечной гласной *ա /a/* простых глаголов в спряжении *Ե/ի /ē/i/* в современных армянских диалектах.** – Сделана попытка показать, что формы императива с конечной гласной *ա /a/* простых глаголов в спряжении *Ե/ի /ē/i/* (из классических армянских спряжений *է /e/* и *ի /i/*) в современных армянских диалектах имеют несколько происхождений. В частности, синхронический и диахронический анализ соответствующих данных из современных армянских диалектов позволил нам выделить три основные линии развития, которые привели к появлению рассматриваемых форм: 1) в

некоторых диалектах (например, в Агулисском, Карчеванском и Какавабердском) эта форма возникла в результате регулярного звукового изменения *էշ /ea/ > շ /a/*; 2) в некоторых говорах Арагатского диалекта аналогичное воздействие трех высокочастотных переходных глаголов, а именно: *շիշլ /asēl/* «говорить», 2 л. повел. *շիշ /asa/* «скажи!», *շծլ /acēl/* (изначально означавший «приносить, приводить!», позже «наполнять»), 2 л. повел. *շծի /aca/* (изначально означавший «приноси!, приводи!», позже «наполняй!») и *շնլ /anēl/* «делать», 2 л. повел. *շրի /ara/* «делай!», скорее всего, стало причиной появления рассматриваемой формы, причем глагол *շիշլ /asēl/* «говорить» сыграл ключевую роль в этом процессе; 3) в некоторых других диалектах (например, в Байазетском и Диадинском, а также в Алашкертском говоре), кажется, произошло звуковое изменение *է /ē/ > շ /a/* в энклитической форме 3-го лица единственного числа настоящего времени вспомогательного глагола *էլ /em/*, вероятно, из-за артикуляционного ослабления мышечного напряжения. Позже эта гласная *շ /a/* была перенесена посредством аналогии из формы настоящего времени 3-го лица единственного числа вспомогательного глагола на 3-е лицо единственного числа оптатива глаголов в спряжении *է /e/*, а оттуда на 2-е лицо единственного числа повелительного наклонения.

**Ключевые слова:** форма императива с конечной гласной *շ /a/*, современные армянские диалекты, аналогическое воздействие, высокочастотные переходные глаголы, звуковое изменение *է /ē/ > շ /a/*, артикуляционное ослабление, 2-е лицо единственного числа повелительного наклонения

## References

Abrahamyan, A. Grabari jeřnark, [A manual of Grabar], Yer., 1976.

Аčarean, H. K'nnut'iwn Nor-Juլayi barbari [Study of the dialect of Nor-Jula], Yer., 1940.

Аčaryan, H. Hay barbařagtitut'iwn: uruagic ew dasaworut'iwn hay barbarneri, [Armenian dialectology: A sketch and classification of Armenian dialects], Moskua: Nor-Naxijewan, (Ēminean azgagrakan շօլovacu, vol. 8), 1911.

Аčaryan, H. Hayerēn armatakan bařaran [Armenian root dictionary], in 4 vols (2nd edn.), Yer., 1971–1979, Vol. 2, Yer.,

Аčaryan, H. K'nnut'yun Vani barbari [Study of the dialect of Van], Yer., 1952.

Аčaryan, H. Liakatar k'erakanut'yun hayoc' lezvi [Complete grammar of the Armenian language], Vol. 4, Part 1, Yer., 1959, Vol. 4, Part 2, Yer., 1961.

Aikhenvald, A. Y. Imperatives and Commands, Oxford University Press, 2010.

Asatryan, M. Hay barbařagtitut'yan gorcnakan ašxatank'neri jeřnark [A Manual of practical works of Armenian dialectology], Yer., 1985.

Asatryan, M. Lorū xosvack'ə [The subdialect of Lorii], Yer., 1968.

Asatryan, M. Urmiaiy (Xoyi) barbařə [The dialect of Urmia (Xoy)], Yer., 1962.

Aštarak k'ālak'. Hayereni barbařagtitakan atlasi antip nyut'er [Town Aštarak. Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas], tetr № 151.

Avetyan, S. Arewelahayereni bayi yelənakneri abelyanakan meknabanut'yunə, ditarkvac ardi lezvabanut'yan tesankyunic' [Abeļyan's Interpretation of Verb Moods in Eastern Armenian, Considered from the Viewpoint of Modern Linguistics] // Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut'yun [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2024, Vol. 3, SP1, pp. 34-44.

Avetyan, S. Main factors conditioning the absence of the final *n* and the origin of the final *h* of the imperative singular in Armenian dialects. // Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut'yun [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2023. № 1, pp. 68-78.

**Avetyan, S.** On One Important Peculiarity of the Imperative Singular in the Dialect of Ararat // Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut'yun [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2023, № 3, pp. 30-38.

**Aytənean, A.** K'nnakan K'erakanut'iwn ašxarhabar kam ardi hayerēn lezui, [A Critical Grammar of the Ašxarhabar or Modern Armenian language], Vienna, 1866.

**Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan, S. H.** Araratyan barbari xosvack'nerə Hoktemberyani šrjanum [The Ararat subdialects in the district of Hoktemberyan], Yer., 1973.

**Bybee, J.** Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language, Oxford University Press, 2007.

**Danielyan, T'.** Malat'iayi barbarə [The dialect of Malat'ia], Yer., 1967.

Elvard. Hayereni barbaragitakan atlas antip nyut'er [Elvard, Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas], tetr № 86.

Diadini barbarə. Hayereni barbaragitakan atlasi antip nyut'er [The dialect of Diadin. Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas], tetr № 8.

**Godel, R.** An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian, Wiesbaden, 1975.

**Grigoryan, A.** Hay barbaragitut'yan dasənt'ac' [A handbook of Armenian dialectology], Yer., 1957.

**Haneyan, A.** Tigranakerti barbarə [The dialect of Tigranakert], Yer., 1978.

**Haspelmath M., Sims, A. D.** Understanding Morphology, 2nd ed., Hodder Education, An Hachette UK Company, 2010.

**Jahukyan, G.** Hay barbaragitut'yan neracut'yun: vičakagrakan barbaragitut'yun [Introduction to Armenian dialectology: statistic dialectology], Yer., 1972.

**Jensen, H.** Altarmenische Grammatik, Heidelberg, 1959.

K'anak'er gyuł. Hayereni barbaragitakan atlasi antip nyut'er [Village K'anak'er. Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas], tetr № 230.

**Karst, J.** Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen, Strassburg, 1901.

**Katvalyan, V.** Bayazeti barbarə ew nra lezvakan ařnč'ut'yunnerə šrjaka barbarneri het [The dialect of Bayazet and its linguistic relationships with surrounding dialects], Yer., 2016.

**Kostandyan, D.** Erznkayi barbarə [The dialect of Erznka], Yer., 1979.

**Łaribyan, A.** Hay barbaragitut'yun: hnč'yunabanut'yun ew jewabanut'yun [Armenian dialectology: phonology and morphology], Yer., 1953.

**Madat'yan, K'.** Alaškerti xosvack'ə (Aparan-Aragaci tarack') [The subdialect of Alaškert], Yer., 1985.

**Melik', S. Dawit'-Bēk.** Arabkiri gawařabarbarə: jaynabanakan ew k'erakanakan usumnasiru'iwn [The dialect of Arabkir: a phonetic and grammatical study], Vienna, 1919.

**Mežunc', B.** Šamšadin-Dilijani xosvack'ə [The subdialect of Šamšadin-Dilijan], Yer., 1989.

Muñi gyuł. Hayereni barbaragitakan atlasi antip nyut'er [Village Muñi. Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas], tetr № 44.

**Muradyan, H.** Kak'avaberdi barbarə [The dialect of Kak'avaberd], Yer., 1967.

**Muradyan, H.** Karčewanı barbarə [The dialect of Karčewan], Yer., 1960.

Nor bařgirk' haykazean lezui [New Dictionary of the Armenian language], Vol., 1-2, (Venetik, 1836-1837).

Ošakan gyuł. Hayereni barbaragitakan atlasi antip nyut'er [Village Oshakan. Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas], tetr № 20.

**Petoyan, V.** Sasuni barbarə [The dialect of Sasun], Yer., 1954.

**Šarabxanyan, P.** Grabari dasynt'ac' [A Course of Grabar], Yer., 1974.

**Sargseanc', S.** Agulec'oc' barbarə (zōkeri lezun): lezuabanakan hetazötut'iwn [The dialect of Agulis: a linguistic study]. Vols. 1-2, Moscow, 1883.

**Xač'atryan, V.** Vardenisi (Diadini) barbarə [The dialect of Vardenis (Diadin)], Yer., 2004.